DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 656 CS 002 061

AUTHOR Curran, Faye
TITLE Developmental Education through the Eyes of the Special Interest Group for Two Year Colleges of the International Reading Association.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Reading Programs; *Community Colleges; *Developmental Programs; *Developmental Reading; Financial Support; Instructional Staff; Junior Colleges; Mathematics Instruction; National Surveys; Remedial Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS International Reading Association

ABSTRACT

The Developmental Education Questionnaire was mailed nationwide, in November 1974, to members of the Special Interest Group for Two Year Colleges of the International Reading Association. Responses were made by 109 of the 252 members. The purpose of the questionnaire was to develop a profile of the organization of developmental education programs and how they fit into college programs throughout the country. The data from the questionnaire are analyzed, and tables and discussions are presented on the following topics: types of colleges represented, day and night enrollments, kinds of labs, course titles, tutoring, financial breakdown of tutoring programs, auspices under which programs operate, instructional formats, staffing, lab facilities, reporting patterns of instructors and respondents, program funding, and selection of advisory committees. Three major themes recurred in exploring the unique features of developmental education: (1) the individualization of materials for the learner, (2) the dedication of personnel, and (3) the tie-in of skills to the content areas. (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED109656

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION THROUGH THE EYES OF THE SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP FOR TWO YEAR COLLEGES OF THE INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

Developed by: Mrs. Faye Curran
Miami University-Middletown
4200 E. University Boulevard
Middletown, OH

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Faye Curran

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 002 061

F O R E W A R D

Until my work on this questionnaire my knowledge of the brain power and time involved in such an endeavor was quite limited. Many fine people helped in the completion of this study.

Without the valued assistance of Dr. Bernard W. Fuhr from the Guidance Department of Miami University, who walked with me through the steps in the study's compilation, it would have been impossible to have the organized by-produce that resulted.

The last questionnaire didn't reach me until March 14, and this study had to be ready for the International Reading Association Convention before May 9. Dr. Fuhr understood the concentrated work involved, because of this limited time frame, and offered encouragement when my spirits were sagging. I cannot thank him enough.

Also, in the questionnaire's inception Dr. Richard Bryson, President of Marion Technical College, gave his knowledge of organizing a questionnaire. He helped insure a good format. For this I owe him much gratitude.

Additionally, Mr. Louis E. Welshofer of Armco Corporation deserves a real vote of thanks for the distribution of the questionnaires to the members of the Special Interest Group for Two Year Colleges of the International Reading Association.

Also, my boss, Mr. Joe Ayer deserves my gratitude for bringing to my attention Mr. Welshofer's search for a topic in his research course. This circumstance led to the mailing of the questionnaires.

Lorraine Beitler, President of the Special Interest Group for Two Year Colleges of the International Reading Association deserves praise for her suggestion that the questionnaire and simulated visits to Developmental Education programs might be useful to members of the Special Interst Group.

Lastly, Dr. Eugene Bennett, Director of Miami University-Middletown, has my appreciation for his supportive attitude toward the questionnaire and all that it involved.

The Developmental Education Questionnaire being reported upon in this paper was first composed for distribution within Ohio. Shortly after its dissemination a request was made that its coverage be enlarged, and, in November of 1974, the questionnaire was mailed nationwide to the 252 members of the Special Interest Group for Two Year Colleges of the International Reading Association. Twenty-five of the questionnaires were returned unopened. Of the possible ones remaining 118 were returned giving a 51.9 percent response.

TABLE I

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Sent to members of the association	252
Number of questionnaires returned	118
Number of questionnaires returned by postman	25
Number of questionnaires responded to	109

STATE DISTRIBUTIONS

Ohio	12	California	2
Illinois	12	Georgia	2
		Alabama	2
New York	10	Minnesota	2
		Wisconsin	2
Michigan	9	Colorado	2
Missouri	9		
		Washington	1
New Jersey	6	Hawaii	1
Pennsylvania	6	Connecticut	1
		Massachusetts	1
Florida	5	Idaho	1
		Rhode Island	1
Oregon	4	Arizona	1
Kansas	4	Louisiana	1
Maryland	4	Maine	1
		New Mexico	1
Nebraska	3	Mississippi	1
Iowa	3	Indiana	1
Texas	3	Vancouver, B. C.	1
Virginia	3		

The purpose of this questionnaire was to develop a profile of the organization of Developmental Education programs and how they fit into college programs throughout the country. It has been the writer's experience that Developmental Education programs are diverse. The writer has attempted to visit as many of them as possible in order to see them in operation, but in-person visits are necessarily limited; wishing to know more about the organization of Developmental Education Programs on a broader scale, the author developed the questionnaire as an attempt to learn more about Developmental Education across the country.

As an outgrowth of the Developmental Education Questionnaire there developed the idea of having a program of "Simulated Visits" to Developmental Education programs as a display at the 1975 International Reading Association Convention in New York City. Through these "Simulated Visits," using posters, brochures, pictures, graphs, charts, films, filmstrips, and samples of original materials in actual use, IRA conferees will be given an opportunity to make a proxy visit to many Developmental Education programs which they would normally never see.

The combination of the "Simulated Visits" and the materials from the questionnaire will serve to give a personal supermarket shopping tour of Developmental Education programs across the country.

TABLE II

TYPES OF COLLEGES REPRESENTED IN THE DATA

Category	Number	Percentage
Private 2 year college	6	5.1
Private 4 year college	3	2.5
Community college	76	64.4
Technical college	6	5.1
Municipal college	2	1.7
2 year state institution	8	6.8
4 year state institution	16	13.6
Not identified	1	.8
	118	100.0

It is clear from Table II that most of the respondents represented community colleges. Four of the respondents qualified their answers by saying that they

were "from two year community colleges," and one specified a "two year private community college."

The second set of information called for in the questionnaire concerned day and night college enrollments. This information was requested for both 1974 and 1975. It is clear from the data received that the Developmental Education programs are more plentiful in schools of small to medium size. Over fifty percent of those responding placed themselves in the 5,000 and under enrollment categories. Some schools said that they could not distinguish between day and night enrollments since some students took courses during both time frames.

The next area canvassed was designed to reflect the different kinds of labs maintained in the Developmental Education programs.

TABLE III

LABS INCORPORATED WITH DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A. Reading Lab		Percent
Yes	109	92.4
No	1	0.8
No answer	8	6.8

B. Writing Lab		Percent
Yes	80	67.8
No	7	5.9
No answer	31	26.3

C. Math Lab		Percent
Yes	61	51.7
No	10	8.5
No answer	47	39.8

D. Study Skills Lab		Percent
Yes	91	77.1
No	6	5.1
No answer	21	17.8

E. Other Types of Programs		Percent
Yes	47	39.8
No	2	1.7
No answer	69	58.5

Under the category of "other" in Table III it was found that whereas the majority of schools have all their labs under a central program heading, math or English labs are frequently under respective departments.

Courses on "How to Take Tests" were found to exist on a small scale mainly in the areas of GED (high school equivalency) and LSAT (the exam used for law school entrance).

Various names were used to label central programs, ranging from acronyms like ESL and Palab to more traditional appellations such as Media Center and Adult Learning Center.

Individualization seemed to be the keynote of most of these labs as evidenced by:

1. Individual testing for departments
2. Multi-modal/multi-media materials that supplement classroom instruction
3. Walk-in programs
4. Topical seminars in areas in which students express a need
5. Individualized electronic and chemistry courses
6. Special learning materials developed in cooperation with other departments
7. Courses by requests of departments as in the case of a mini course in "research methods" for the social sciences

Several schools made provisions for an on-going program of working with the faculty through new faculty seminars and in-service teacher training.

Programs mentioned once included a program taken to an Indian reservation, a Title I program, a Project II remedial program, a couseling lab, and a library orientation lab.

Speech therapy and ESL (English as a second language) were programs mentioned in several schools.

The next area of inquiry concerned itself with tutoring as a facet of Developmental Education programs.

TABLE V

TUTORING IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Tutoring	YES	Percent	NO	No Answer
Had individual	97	82.2		21
Had group	49	41.5		69
Had auto-tutorial	48	40.7		70
Had all school	14	11.9		104
Had limited to students on probation	3	2.5	1	114
Had limited to student who failed	1	0.8	1	116
Available by student request	94	79.7		24
Available by instructor referral	89	75.4		29
Available by adviser referral	71	60.2		47
Performed by students	70	59.3		48
Performed by Developmental Education personnel	30	25.4		88
Performed by subject instructors	35	29.7		83

Most schools showed individual tutoring to be available whereas less than half showed group or auto-tutorial provisions.

Tutoring was not found to be limited to those who failed or were on probation; however only a few schools offered it to the whole student body. Comments from the questionnaire indicated that much tutoring was usually available in the isolated departments or in particular segments of the schools reporting.

Funding for tutoring programs was also a vital concern.

TABLE VI

FINANCIAL BREAKDOWNS FOR TUTORING COSTS

	Tutoring	Frequency	Percentage
Paid by institution	80-100%	44	37.3
	40-50%	11	9.3
	20-30%	4	3.4
	0-19%	4	3.4
	Zero	1	0.8
	No answer	54	45.8
		118	100.0
Cost Underwritten by Subsidy	80-100%	10	8.5
	60-79%	3	2.5
	40-59%	10	8.5
	20-39%	1	0.8
	0-19%	1	0.8
	Zero	33	28.0
	No answer	60	50.8
		118	100.0

As can be seen from Table VI slightly less than half of the institutions represented paid as much as 80-100 percent of the tutoring costs.

Only twenty-one percent of the 118 responding schools stated that subsidy funds comprised any part of their tutoring costs.

Fifty-three percent of the Developmental Education programs canvassed were supported to some extent by their institutions.

These data seem to indicate a higher proportion of institutions bearing the cost for their own Developmental Education Programs rather than using state subsidy in funding them.

The large sector of "no answers" may well indicate a lack of information on this subject.

Most frequently tutoring services were offered in English, math, the sciences, writing, reading, and study skills. These fields were cited as "major need" areas. Frequently it was noted that upon request, tutoring was available in any subject.

Grade levels were of negligible importance in the tutoring within the sampled schools. Occasionally a level limitation of the thirteenth or fourteenth grade was mentioned; however, in general all grade levels within the college were included.

In exploring the special or unique features of the Developmental Education programs three major themes were recurrent. These were:

1. The individualization of materials for the learner
2. The dedication of Developmental Education personnel
3. The tie-in of skills to the content areas

Under "individualization of materials" mention was made ot modular formats based on behavioral objectives, mastery units, alternatives to classes, individualized prescription developed with the student, and open registration wherein a student can enter and finish at anytime.

In the category of "teacher dedication" comments made said "we care," the lab is always open, we have morning and afternoon and evening classes, we offer faculty development, we follow up, and, we have accountability and performance contracts.

"Skills" were tied into the content areas through course pairing of reading or writing with an academic discipline, by taking the skills courses to the academic classroom, by teaching a course alongside a study program, and by an interdisciplinary approach.

The next consideration of our study was the auspice under which a Developmental Education program operated.

TABLE VII

LOCATION AND CONTROL

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Separate department	25	21.2
English	17	14.4
Counseling	11	9.3
Special services	10	8.5
Student services	9	7.6
Humanities	5	4.2
Minority affairs	1	0.8
Other	33	28.0
No answer	7	5.9

Some schools indicated a hierarchy of control.

As a Developmental Education program is often housed in a subject department it was only natural that since this subject department would fall under a division of the school the Developmental Education program would likewise fall under that umbrella. Hence the Developmental Education program would have been under several layers of authority.

In other schools Developmental Education was viewed as a separate undertaking and was relegated to a separate academic department or center again responsible to a division.

In some cases Developmental Education is considered a plum due to state monies and federal funding that support the programs. This situation may also contribute to such programs falling under multiple auspices.

A fourth possible cause for multiple auspices may have been the relative newness of many such programs, which are seeking their proper place in the college picture. For them it is possible that the answers on our questionnaires indicated an evolutionary process.

Under the "other" category thirty-five different responses were given showing the diversity of possible auspices for Developmental Education Programs. Some

of these categories included Continuing Education, Special Projects for the Handicapped, Division of Allied Health, Communication Division, Experimental Studies, Evening Division Program, and Student Life.

The next concern of the questionnaires focused on the instructional formats of Developmental Education programs.

TABLE VIII

INSTRUCTIONAL FORMATS OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Category	Frequency	Percentage	None	No Answer
Have formal credit courses	94	79.7		24
Have formal non-credit courses	60	50.8	1	57
Have tutoring	86	72.9		32
Have mini-courses	57	48.3	1	60
Other	45	38.1	1	72

Table VIII clearly shows a preponderance of schools offering credit courses and tutoring services. Their frequency, in a study that showed diversity as a hallmark of Developmental Education programs, would seem to validate them as two essential approaches for a Developmental Education program to reach its intended objectives.

A few schools offered both credit and non-credit courses. The frequency of mini-course offerings was also noteworthy.

Other areas mentioned incorporated confluent reading incorporating psychosynthesis, specialty for health services and others, AV instruction in vocational technical education, running readability formulas for faculty, group presentations for residence hall groups, a second semester remedial course, recertification courses for public school teachers in reading, peer counselors, video tapes, TBA (to be arranged) courses, cognitive mapping programs, exploratory college, and high school workshops.

Staffing of Developmental Education programs was another important concern of our study.

TABLE IX

STAFFING OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Had instructors	64	54.2
Had peer tutors	37	31.4
Had graduate student tutors	19	16.1
Had paraprofessionals	15	12.7
Had counselors	9	7.6
Had programmers	6	5.1
Had faculty tutors	2	1.7
Had assistant instructors	2	1.7

As was expected many programs had both instructors and peer tutors. A new element revealed by the survey was the presence of graduate students as tutors. Because there were three private and sixteen public four-year institutions represented in the study it's possible that these same institutions had their own graduate programs from which graduate students were drawn to work as tutors.

An almost unanimous basic objective for Developmental Education as cited by the respondents to this study was to upgrade skills in reading, writing, and math and to provide other supportive services to insure a student's academic success.

Lab facilities were the next consideration of the survey.

A number of programs were found to be in libraries. Chairs, tables, and carrels were the usual furnishings.

Frequent mention was made of limited space (1-2 rooms) and few materials.

Some programs enjoyed carpeting, lounge areas for students, offices, small rooms, and meeting areas with a good view of the campus. Paperbacks, boxed materials, filmstrips, workbooks, published and unpublished materials were in use in a number of programs.

No novel equipment was mentioned. One respondent said the most important piece of equipment is the blackboard. A number of respondents commented that they use little equipment. About an equal number from the equipment users enumerated several types of equipment that are traditionally found in Developmental Education programs.

Next the questionnaire sought to learn "who is the person to whom the respondent reports?" Interestingly there were a number of answers revealing that more than one person was reported to. This condition would seem in keeping with Table VII in which it was discovered that many programs operate under multiple auspices.

TABLE X

REPORTING PATTERNS OF RESPONDENTS

	Category	Frequency	Percent
TO:	Director of academic interest/provost	38	32.2
	Director of program or department	25	21.2
	Division chairman	17	14.4
	Head of English or Communication Dept.	13	11.0
	Dean of Student Services or Director of Counseling	7	5.9
	Chairman of Humanities	4	3.4
	Director of President of College	4	3.4
	Assistant Director of Department	2	1.7
	Director of Continuing Education	1	0.9
	No answer	7	5.9
		118	100.0

The majority of respondents were heads of Developmental Education programs and this situation is reflected in the fact that the majority report to the academic dean, to a division chairman, or chairman of some department over Developmental Education. In four smaller institutions the instructors reported that they were directly responsible to the president or director of the school.

TABLE XI

INSTRUCTOR'S REPORTING PATTERN

	Category	Frequency	Percent
TO:	Director of Developmental Education program	67	56.8
	Dean of Academic Instruction	11	9.3
	English Department or Communication Department Chairman	8	6.8
	Division Chairman	6	5.1
	Heads of Departments	5	4.2
	Chairman of Humanities	3	2.5
	Assistant Director of Program	1	0.85
	Director of College	1	0.85
	Instructor	1	0.85
	No answer	15	12.7

Table XI shows that the instructors usually report to the head of a Developmental Education program. Some report to this person and also to another source. Again this dual status calls our attention to the multiple auspices under which many Developmental programs operate.

The questionnaire also explored the ways in which programs were funded.

TABLE XIII

PROGRAM FUNDING

	Category	Frequency	Percent
BY:	Departmental funds/college budget/general funds	46	39.0
	State subsidy	30	25.4
	Federal government funds	11	9.3
	Tuition and/or lab fees	7	5.9
	County or city tax	4	3.4
	University college funds	4	3.4
	State subsidy and special state funds	4	3.4
	District funds	3	2.5
	State subsidy and county tax levy	1	0.9
	No answer	8	6.8
		118	100.0

Departmental or general funds and subsidy funding appear to supply the majority of monies. All of the other sources combined equal less than either of these categories.

After learning the sources of funding the next pursuit was to determine the percentage of funding from state subsidy contributions.

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS FROM STATE SUBSIDY

Category	Frequency	Percent
100%	5	4.2
86-99%	2	1.7
76-85%	4	3.4
66-75%	2	1.7
51-65%	1	0.9
36-50%	13	11.0
21-35%	7	5.9
0-20%	17	14.4
None	14	11.9
No answer	53	44.9

It is interesting to note that fourteen programs operate totally devoid of state subsidy funding while another seventeen operate on twenty percent or less state subsidy monies.

The large "no answer" category may suggest that other sources of funding support their programs or that the respondents may not know the breakdown on funding.

Our final probe regarding funding was to uncover imposed program requirements on Developmental Education as a result of allocated monies.

No requirements for funding were given in about seventy-five percent of the sampled schools. Occasionally respondents mentioned quarterly progress reports, evaluation team visits, on-going evaluation and results, federal guidelines, credited college programs, state grant money used only for non-credit courses and tutoring, auditable records, programs open to all students, an interdisciplinary approach, and funding which must be used by the end of the year or be forfeited.

Inquiry was made regarding the respondent's panel in the selection of advisory committees.

TABLE XIV

SELECTION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	22	18.6
No	84	71.2
No answer	12	10.2

Some of the "no" answers were qualified by the fact that programs were new or that plans were being made to select advisory committees.

Since some schools maintained advisory committees and others expressed intentions for developing them we also sought the function of existing advisory committees.

TABLE XV

FUNCTIONS OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Category	Frequency	Percent
Advisory	27	22.9
Information receiving	1	0.85
Policy making	4	3.4
Advisory and information receiving	4	3.4
Information-receiving and policy making	1	0.85
Policy making and regulatory	1	0.85
Other	1	0.85
No answer	79	66.9

In Table XV we found that only twenty-two selected Developmental Education advisory committees. In Table XIII we have thirty-nine that represent one of the categories of functions. This disparity is explained by two factors. The first is that some schools have standing committees that are administratively appointed and thus the Developmental Education staff would have no connection with their selection. The second factor is that of new programs which have intentions to select committees.

Some programs for which these are in the planning stages, indicated the function/functions to be served by them.

Under the category of "other" we find that advisory committees sometimes include students, that they can initiate courses, they do consultations, and they help with publicity.

It is apparent that these committees can be as diverse in their functions as are the Developmental programs that they serve and help to shape.

Next was an investigation into the programs that have resulted from advisory committees. The vast majority gave no answer to this inquiry. This is in keeping with the fact that seventy-nine of our 118 samples left unanswered the question, "Do your schools have advisory committees in Developmental Education?"

From those schools which responded the picture ran the gamut from no contributions to the entire program being a result of the advisory committee. Within this continuum respondents reported ESL components, placement testing, consultation on grant programs, materials needs, an adult counseling program, a new course in speech reading, classroom visitations, tutoring, satellite areas, GRE, PPER, ABE, credit programs, and a personal development seminar.

After learning about enrollments, objectives, staffing, content, and funding of the Developmental Education program the next area in our inquiry was evaluation of these programs.

TABLE XVII

RATINGS OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Category	Rating	Number	Percent
Faculty	Excellent	25	21.2
	Good	10	8.5
	Fair	8	6.8
	Poor	4	3.4
	No answer	71	60.2
Students	Excellent	31	26.3
	Good	10	8.5
	Fair	2	1.7
	Poor	2	1.7
	No answer	73	61.9
Administration	Excellent	29	24.6
	Good	10	8.5
	Fair	3	2.5
	Poor	2	1.7
	No answer	74	62.7

Implicit in the comments made about ratings is the state of faculty reception to Developmental Education programs. Comments indicated that this reception ran the gamut from mild indifference through paranoia to hostility.

This reaction was a paradox when one considers declining college enrollments and the faculty who are out of jobs as a result of this decline. Developmental Education programs reduce attrition and thereby increase enrollment which helps to retain faculty positions. Developmental Education also makes students more efficient in their studies. This fact alone eases the work of the professors. Developmental Education helps students get and retain what professors have dispensed. It is not enough to give out information and say learn it whatever way you can. Developmental Education recognizes this and shows students how to learn this dispensed information and how to retain it. The end result is a higher caliber student.

According to the questionnaire students and administrators seem more receptive to Developmental Education programs. Perhaps this is because students know when they are being helped and administrators want the best to help their students.

The composition of summer faculty in Developmental Education programs was the next area explored.

TABLE XVIII

SUMMER FACULTY

Category	Frequency	Percent
Regular full-time faculty	76	64.4
Regular school year part-time	4	3.4
Lab and class faculty	1	0.8
Summer faculty only	4	3.4
Regular faculty and summer faculty	7	5.9
No faculty	9	7.6
No answer	17	14.4

As can be seen from Table XVIII most summer programs are run by regular faculty members.

Some schools are on twelve month calendars and their instructors teach year round whereas the majority hire their regular faculty for summer work on an overtime basis.

The general trend was toward a reduced regular faculty. An example given was one instructor to teach the classroom and one to man the lab. One program offered no classes but did testing for all new fall quarter students (app. 800 students) during a summer orientation session. The point was made that in some programs no continuity exists between winter and summer programs and that this was a definite weakness.

Still other respondents indicated that their programs are new and plans for summer programs haven't been finalized. Many stated that the summer program is a limited version of the regular year's program.

The final interest in our inquiry was to determine what objective measures are used in follow-up in the evaluation of Developmental Education programs.

TABLE XIX

FOLLOW-UP MEASURES FOR EVALUATION

Category	Frequency	Percent
Tutor/tutee evaluations	6	5.1
Standardized tests	23	23.7
Feedback from students in classes	20	16.9
Faculty evaluation	4	3.4
Yearly reports on aims reached or professional evaluation teams or self-evaluation seminars	7	5.9
Enrollment figures from students in the program	4	3.4
Grade point average	7	5.9
No evaluation or informal ones	21	17.8
No answer	21	17.8

Standardized tests seem to be the major form of evaluation used. It is noteworthy that twenty-one used no evaluations or only informal ones and an additional twenty-one did not respond to this question.

The second most frequently used evaluation procedure was student feedback.

Earlier we discovered that better than half of our respondents had no ratings of the Developmental Education program by faculty, students, or administration. Here we can see a situation that might partially explain a lack of ratings as there is a dearth of evaluation done as follow-up in these programs.

Under the "other" comments it was revealed that the majority of procedures used were formal in nature. These ranged from accountability studies, evaluation team visits, standardized tests, grade point average and drop out studies, and graduation studies to longitudinal studies of Developmental Education students, sociological follow-up interviews with Developmental Education students, and computer programs to evaluate success.

One respondent said that their computer evaluation attempt produced inconclusive results.

Informal measures used included inventories, teacher-prepared tutor/tutee evaluations, student interviews, and self-evaluation seminars.

One respondent stated that the whole idea of a follow-up was a futuristic notion.

Interestingly one respondent stated that the students tell them and others of the value of Developmental Education. This program operates on a voluntary basis and the respondent indicated that for a voluntary enrollment program to suceed it must produce. (This particular college has credit courses but enrollment in the program is voluntary.)

This study revealed diversity as the keynote of Developmental Education programs throughout the country. Credit courses, tutoring, dedication of Developmental Education personnel, innovative tie-in of Developmental Education work to the content of academic subjects, and quick acceptance of Developmental Education programs by students and administrators but a slower reception to them by faculties seem to be the universal characteristics.